

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 12-15, 18-19, 21, 24-40 are pending in this application. By this amendment, claims 1, 5, 8, 13-15, 18, 21, 24, 26-28, 30-34, 37 and 39-40 are amended and claims 2 and 4 are cancelled. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicant appreciates the courtesies shown to Applicant's representatives by Examiner Hillery during the personal interview held October 20, 2005. Applicant's separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks. The claims presented by this amendment are amended as discussed during the interview.

I. §112 Rejection

Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 18, 19, 21, 24 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed during the October 20 interview with the Examiner, claims 1, 15 and 21 are amended to recite that injectable control content is inserted into the received document "at a specified location adjacent to the link to the retrievable item." During the interview the Examiner agreed that such an amendment would correct the indefiniteness identified by the Office Action. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

II. §102(e) Rejection

Claims 1, 5, 8-10, 13-15, 18, 19, 21, 24 and 38-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent 6,605,120 to Fields et al. ("Fields"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "inserting injectable control content into the received document **at a specified location adjacent to the link** to the retrievable item. . . wherein the injectable control content may be selected by a user to perform a functional operation **upon the retrievable item identified by the link**." (Emphasis added.) As discussed during the interview, Fields does not disclose, teach or suggest such features.

In Fields, the injected control content is not inserted "**at a specified location adjacent to the link**" but is inserted at a position relative to the web page as a whole. Further, in Fields, controls inserted within a document may perform operations on the document that contains the link; however, nowhere does Fields disclose, teach or suggest performing "a functional operation **upon the retrievable item identified by the link**," as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Fields. Claims 15 and 21 include features similar to those described above with respect to claim 1, and are likewise patentably distinguishable over Fields for at least the reasons stated above. The remaining claims depend from one of claims 1, 15 and 21 and are likewise patentably distinguishable over Fields for at least their dependence on an allowable base claim, as well as for additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. §103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fields in view of U.S. Patent 6,301,586 to Yang et al. ("Yang"). Further, the Office Action rejects claims 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fields in view of U.S. Patent 6,738,841 to Wolff ("Wolff"). Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 26-29 and 31-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fields in view of Wolff and further in view of Yang. Yet further, the Office Action rejects claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Fields in view of Wolff and Yang and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,618,163 to Roosen et al. ("Roosen"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, independent claims 1, 15 and 21 recite, *inter alia*, "inserting injectable control content into the received document at a specified location adjacent to the link to the retrievable item . . . wherein the injectable control content may be selected by a user to perform a functional operation upon the retrievable item identified by the link." (Emphasis added.) As discussed above, Fields does not teach or suggest such features. Yang, Wolff, Roosen also do not disclose, teach or suggest such features. Therefore, any combination of Fields, Yang, Wolff, Roosen cannot make up for the identified deficiencies and would not have rendered obvious the invention recited in claims 1, 15 and 21. The remaining claims depend from one of independent claims 1, 15 and 21 and therefore include features similar to those described above. Therefore, these claims are allowable at least for their dependence on an allowable base claim. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 5, 8-10, 12-15, 18-19, 21, 24-40 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

J. Adam Neff
Registration No. 41,218

JAO:JMH

Date: November 7, 2005

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037
--